UNITED NATIONS

A

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/45/PV.63
28 December 1990

ENGLISH

Forty-fifth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 10 December 1990, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. de MARCO (Malta)

- The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General [35] (continued)
- Statement by the President of the General Assembly on the occasion of Human Rights Day 1990
- Report of the Security Council [11]
- Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs [17] (continued)

  (g) Appointment of members of the Committee on Conferences: note by the Secretary-General
- Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council [41]

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-64448/A 4125V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 35 (continued)

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/45/595, A/45/709 and A/45/726)

Mr. SOMAVIA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The Secretary-General of our Organization began his annual report on its work by stating:

> "The period we have entered is Janus-faced. It wears both the aspect of hope and the countenance of dangerous unrestraint. In one major segment of world affairs, we have witnessed political change of a phenomenal character. In large parts of the globe, however, the scene continues to be one of simmering resentments, violent collisions and at best a precarious peace". (A/45/1, p. 2)

These words are indeed a very wise diagnosis of the present state of affairs of our planet. On the positive side of the ledger reference is made to the end of the cold war and the political events that have ensued in Eastern and Central Europe, in Latin America and in other countries; on the negative side, these words refer to the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq and the problem of the Middle East as we have known it since the 1940s. The latter is the subject that is once again before the General Assembly.

The international community is confronting a conflict at the core of which is a network of economic and political interests, of passions, aspirations and national claims.

The United Nations has been in the Middle East ever since the outbreak of the conflict. Now there are three United Nations peace-keeping operations in the region: two peace-keeping forces - the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), on the Golan Heights, and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon - and one observer mission, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, with

(Mr. Somavia, Chile)

headquarters in Jerusalem. Chile has contributed military observers to these activities ever since they began, and we shall continue to do so in the future.

Reference should also be made to the valuable work being done in the area by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, a body to which Chile has made a modest contribution.

Chile is concerned that the end of the cold war has not extended to the Middle East. Based on our recent experience as a nation, we are convinced that peoples should, and indeed can, resolve their differences and disputes by peaceful means. That is why we support the diplomatic option and the opportunity for peace offered by Security Council resolution 678 (1990) with a view to resolving the crisis in the Gulf, and Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), on the Arab-Israeli problem and on the question of Palestine. We hold the same view with regard to Security Council resolution 425 (1978), on the situation in southern Lebanon, where the United Nations peace-keeping force has not yet been able to discharge its mandate fully.

My Government was one of the first to condemn Iraq's invasion and annexation of Kuwait. We unreservedly support the 12 resolutions adopted by the Security Council. We have taken all the necessary internal measures to abide by the sanctions imposed by the Council. These sanctions, I should repeat from this rostrum, have damaged my country's economy as they have damaged the economies of many developing countries, especially oil-importing countries and the least developed countries.

As we stated in the general debate in the Second Committee on 10 August last, there is an economic and social dimension to the Gulf crisis which, in our view, has been relegated to the background by our Organization. Regrettably, the Gulf crisis has been a case in which the United Nations has practised a double

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Somavia, Chile)

standard. There has been great efficiency, concentrated efforts and a determination to deal with the political and strategic dimensions of the situation. However, the social and economic consequences affecting all Members of the Organization have been overlooked. I am referring in particular to the negative effect on so many developing countries caused by the surge in the price of oil. Inflation has increased and this has led to a significant increase in external debt. Speculation in oil prices and its effects on the poorest, dispossessed peoples of the world are as important in their human dimensions, as are the political aspects of the crisis.

I repeat that speculation in oil prices has an adverse effect on the world's poorest people. The human dimensions of this problem are as important as its political aspects. We wish to express our thanks to the Secretary-General for his initiative in convening an informal meeting of experts on this subject. We hope that the conference that was held in Paris a few weeks ago will have profitable results. But still ahead of us on the agenda of the United Nations is the need to deal with economic and social problems with the same political will, the same determination and desire to find a solution as have been manifested in the political and strategic areas. But this is not the situation as it is today.

(Mr. Somavia, Chile)

As regards the Arab-Israeli conflict and the question of Palestine, the position of my Government is very clear. We believe that a broad, just and lasting solution to the problem must be in keeping with the following principles: first, full observance of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973); secondly, the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied territories; thirdly, the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to exist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries; fourthly, recognition of the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to create their own sovereign State; and fifthly, a solution to the problem of Palestine refugees in keeping with General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 November 1948 and with all subsequent resolutions on this question.

We believe that a peaceful solution to the conflict based on the foregoing principles should be achieved through the convening of an international peace conference under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of all the parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

In connection with this initiative I wish to add that the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, a body elected by the people, adopted an agreement on 30 October 1990, giving its full support to the holding of the planned conference.

Chile regrets that the efforts made to bring about a dialogue between the Israelis and the Palestinians have reached a deadlock. We likewise regret that direct contacts between the United States and the PLO have been suspended. This lack of communication is of concern because it creates a negotiating vacuum. Just as the crisis in the Gulf has produced encouraging developments within the framework of resolution 678 (1990) - and here, of course, I am referring to the anticipated visit of Secretary of State Baker to Baghdad and of Minister Tariq Aziz

(Mr. Somavia, Chile)

to Washington and the release of the hostages - we hope that these meetings within the framework of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) will represent the first steps towards a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the question of Palestine.

Finally, I wish to remind you that with every passing day there is less time to allow reason to prevail in the Gulf. Mankind does not want war. As has always been the case, it would hurt the defenceless the most. Nor does mankind wish to see Iraq's indefensible action rewarded. As we all know, the use of force is always a poor solution. We have an obligation to make possible a peaceful solution. The greatest responsibility rests with Iraq. It must take advantage of the time for dialogue provided by Security Council resolution 678 (1990) so as to meet the demands of the international community.

At the same time, we would appeal to those countries that are preparing for a military option to settle the crisis in the Gulf and to act in the best interests of mankind as a whole. Those who have force at their disposal are the first ones that should act with restraint, caution and care. Above all, they must be reasonable and cautious. We cannot rush into an armed conflict in the Gulf only out of impatience. For the new world order that is emerging - taking its first tentative steps - it is not good for force to be imposed on reason. Historically, those who have advocated solutions based on force have always portrayed them as unavoidable. And it is true, unfortunately, that this has sometimes been the case in the course of the history of mankind.

But we believe the situation in the Gulf today is quite different. The rush - I would even say the great desire - to prepare for the military option is not in keeping with a situation in which the machinery of political negotiation has not been exhausted. It would be a mistake to reject peaceful solutions with undue haste. Humanity would then have a very heavy price to pay.

Mr. ABDUL GHAFFAR (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly considers the item on the situation in the Middle East this year, under the different international circumstances dictated by the political reality and the perspectives of relations between States in the post-cold war era. In contrast, however, talk of peace and war between Israel and Arab countries continues without an end. Indeed, one cannot discern a beginning or an end. One can only see past intermissions full of tension and concern. Thus war and peace in this region seem to be two inseparably interlocked phenomena.

It is my belief that this stems from the Zionist philosophy that draws the boundaries of "Greater Israel" from ancient Hebrew myths. Because of this, Israel's expansionist policies have never considered that there were any boundaries between Israel and the neighbouring Arab countries. It has always looked upon the neighbouring Arab territories as frontiers whose surface area has never been defined or delineated. This is a well-known fact to those of us who have followed the activities of the Zionist movement before the usurpation by that movement of Palestine and after the establishment of a Jewish State that followed an expansionist policy since the General Assembly 1947 partition resolution 181 (II).

Israel has used force to push forward into the territories of neighbouring Arab countries with the aim of imposing its political hegemony and expanding the area of its settler-colonialist State. David Ben-Gurion, the first Israeli Prime Minister, commented as follows on his acceptance of a 1937 British proposal to partition Palestine:

(Mr. Abdul Ghaffar, Bahrain)

(spoke in English)

"The acceptance of Partition does not commit us to renounce Transjordan; one does not demand from anybody to give up his vision. We shall accept a state in the boundaries fixed today, but the boundaries of Zionist aspirations are the concern of the Jewish people and no external factor will be able to limit them."

(spoke in Arabic)

Menachem Begin, after the establishment of Israel in 1948, stated the following:

(spoke in English)

"The partition of the Homeland is illegal. It will never be recognized. The signature of institutions and individuals of the partition agreement is invalid. It will not bind the Jewish people. Jerusalem was and will forever be our capital. Eretz Israel [the Land of Israel] will be restored to the people of Israel. All of it and forever."

(spoke in Arabic)

More than four decades after Menachem Begin's statement, Yitzhak Shamir, the Prime Minister of Israel, explained to the whole world, once again, the essence of the Zionist theory and, to remove any lingering doubt in the minds of those who still show surprise regarding Israel's posture vis-à-vis every Arab or international peace initiative, Shamir stated the following:

"the past leaders of the party left us a clear message to keep the land of Israel from the [Mediterranean] sea to the Jordan [river] for future generations and for the mass immigration and for the Jewish people, most of whom will be gathered into this country." (The Washington Post, 20 November 1990).

(Mr. Abdul Ghaffar, Banrain)

(spoke in Arabic)

As for Israel's expansion in the Lebanese territories, Moshe Arens, the Israeli Minister of Defence, during a visit he made recently to the so-called security belt in southern Lebanon, stated:

> "Israel will not let the Lebanese Government regain its control over the area considered by the Israelis as a security belt in the south of Lebanon. The defence of the northern borders of Israel depends on the control by Israel and the south Lebanon army, of the security belt, and the Gizein area. We do not intend to make any change in the level of this control."

History refutes the false claim by Israel that the wars waged by Israel are in defence of its existence and not battles to widen its boundaries. Those who have read Ben-Gurion's Memoirs must have understood the real meaning of Zionist philosophy. Ben-Gurion's vision of the boundaries of Zionist ambitions in the Middle East embraced an area that extended from the south of Lebanon and the south of Syria to Jordan and Sinai. Ben-Gurion never tired of repeating the following assertion in the debates of the Zionist leadership:

(spoke in English)

> "We do not suggest now to announce the final aim, which is far-reaching, even more so than the aim of those who were opposing partition. I am unwilling to abandon ... the great Jewish vision, the final vision ... This vision is an organic, spiritual and ideological component of my Jewishness and my Zionist aspiration ..."

(spoke in Arabic)

This Zionist strategy in the region explains why the Israeli politicians panicked, as stated by the Israeli writer Amos Elon, in Ha'aretz on 15 November 1981, when President Anwar Sadat in February 1971 proposed a peaceful

(Mr. Abdul Ghaffar, Bahrain)

initiative, which included the conclusion of a peace treaty on the basis of the pre-1967 borders that guaranteed the security of Israel, within recognized borders. When Arab peaceful initiatives were proposed one after the other, the Israeli politicians' panic reached new highs because since the establishment of their State, they used the principle of the Prussian General, Karl Clausewitz, to the effect that war is an extension of politics by different means.

It is well known that Israel has used wars to impose its military hegemony, expand, and build more settlements for emigrant Jews from all over the world. It seems that the Israelis have stood Clausewitz's theory on its head and made peace an extension of war by different means.

This explains clearly the reasons behind the introduction by Israel of nuclear weapons into the Middle East region for the first time. The thesis and antithesis of peace and war in the Zionist philosophy may appear, at first glance, as vague and ambiguous as Machiavelli's arguments on morality and politics, Jean-Jacques Rousseau's sayings on reason and politics, or Karl Marx's views on religion and politics.

However, the ambitions of Israel with regard to peace have become very clear to the Arabs. Israel wants to impose its vision by the force of arms, including nuclear arms, so that it may become the hegemonistic garrison-State and the ghetto State whose tentacles reach out and grab all the countries of the region. Thus, Israel wants to impose coexistence and peace on its own conditions, and wants to control the movement of history in the region, on the basis of its own Zionist logic, regardless of the legitimate rights of others. The Arabs' knowledge, through first-hand experience of the real depths of the Zionist ideology, has made the question of Palestine, to them, an idea which has no geographical parameters, because the Arab struggle against Israel and Zionism is a struggle for survival in the face of the Zionist ambitions of hegemony and expanding boundaries.

(Mr. Abdul Ghaffar, Bahrain)

We believe that peace in the Middle East region will remain an unattainable goal until a clear distinction is made, in the words of Yehoshafat Harkabi, professor at the Hebrew University: "between ideology and political reality". We do not think that Israel can really move towards peace if it hangs on to the Zionist ideology which has no place in it for any conciliatory approach that would liberate it from its unidimensional thinking that wants to impose itself by force and violence.

Mr. BASALAMAH (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The international community is witnessing the fourth year of the intifadah, of the struggling Palestinian people against the Zionist occupation of its territory. This fact demonstrates to the international community as a whole the viability and vitality of the valiant intifadah which will continue until victory is achieved and the State of Palestine is established.

On this occasion we cannot but commend the international community's moral support for the legitimate struggle of the Palestinian people, which is akin to the struggle for their legitimate rights by the people of South Africa, against the white minority.

(Mr. Basalamah, Yemen)

Had it not been for the support by a major Power of the Zionist entity and the racist régime in South Africa, neither of the two régimes could have been able to go on defying world public opinion. The clearest proof of this is the means used by the United States to obstruct the peaceful efforts aimed at achieving a comprehensive, just solution in the Middle East and its rejection of the relevant General Assembly resolutions on this question and on the need to put ar end to the continuing trampling of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

The archives of the United Nations are full of resolutions on the question of Palestine, the Syrian Golan and south Lebanon. Is it not time for the international Organization to take decisive, effective and practical steps to force the Zionist entity to yield to its resolutions regarding the region?

Yemen, like all the other countries of the Arab region, is gravely concerned over the immigration of Soviet Jews from the Soviet Union and from other regions to the land of Palestine in return for certain deals struck at the expense of the Palestinian people as though man were an import and export commodity. This phenomenon poses the greatest threat to the rights of the Palestinian people and aborts every attempt at a peaceful settlement in the region.

The leadership and the people of the Republic of Yemen have always supported and stood in solidarity with the just struggle of the Palestinian people to regain its legitimate rights as well as the struggle of the Lebanese and Syrian peoples for the Syrian Golan and south Lebanon.

We have made it clear that the region will not enjoy a just peace until the Palestinian people is enabled to regain its right to self-determination and the establishment of its independent State. This can only be achieved in the context of an international peace conference which would guarantee the formulation of

(Mr. Basalamah, Yemen)

objective foundations to put an end to the Zionist policies of aggression and provide the Palestinian people with the right to a safe existence like any other people.

Therefore, the international responsiblity for this question is no less significant than its concern with the Gulf crisis.

The Gulf crisis has occupied centre stage because it is unfolding in a region that is considered a vital source of energy. This whets the appetite of major Powers which have often cherished the hope of putting their designs into effect. The unprecedented military build-up makes us think over and over again and ask ourselves why all this concern? Is it because the humanitarian urge has been so strong, or is it that the urge to put into effect a premeditated plan to seize the oil resources of the region and use them to get a stranglehold on the economies of the world - especially the third world, which is paying the price?

The Republic of Yemen has taken a clear-cut position of principle regarding the containment of this crisis. This position is based on clear principle which may be summed up as follows:

First: Yemen has never, and will never, accept the principle of the acquisition of territories of others by force and has not supported the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Yemen has also called for the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and the immediate release of all hostages in addition to the restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait.

Secondly, Yemen does not agree with the use of foreign forces. The advocates of a military solution should have heeded the voices of logic and reason and sided with peace against war and thus spared the region the prospect of a war which will spare no one and nothing.

The Middle East region, the cradle of the monotheistic religions and human civilization, holds the international community responsible for the restoration of

(Mr. Basalamah, Yemen)

peace and stability to all the peoples of the region. My delegation affirms the need to implement United Nations resolutions which have called for complete withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, including Al-Quds, the Syrian Golan and south Lebanon and for enabling the Palestinian people to establish its independent State in the land of Palestine.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to 5 minutes for the second and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. ALI (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): In his speech before the General Assembly on Friday, 7 December, the Israeli representative made several misleading claims concerning Sudan and its relations with the Libyan Arab Jamahariya and Chad.

In exercise of the right of reply, my delegation would like to set the record straight: first, Sudan's relations with Libya go back to historical times and are based on ties of blood, culture and neighbourliness. These relations have developed after the Revolution of National Salvation in Sudan and have reached a point that paves the way to unity between the two countries. The complementarity agreement between the two countries, signed recently, aims at achieving common interests and reciprocity without interference in the internal affairs of either country.

That is why the allegation by the representative of Israel regarding what he called blackmail by Libya of Sudan is unfounded, a distortion of the truth and a cheap attempt at muddying the waters between the two countries.

(Mr. Ali, Sudan)

Secondly, regarding the Chad question, my delegation wishes to state once again that Sudan has always been, and will continue to be, committed to a policy of good-neighbourliness and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries in line with its adherence to the principles of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law. Sudan's efforts to bring about national reconciliation in Chad are known to all, including the parties to the Chad conflict.

(Mr. Ali, Sudan)

In this connection, the record will show that Sudan has put forward a number of initiatives. Sudan believes that the events in Chad are an internal affair. However, our interest in those events arises from our concern that whatever happens here will have repercussions as far as the neighbouring territory of Sudan is concerned.

My delegation seizes this opportunity to state that Sudan does not support either party to the conflict in Chad. All we want is that peace should prevail and that there should be stability in neighbouring countries.

One of the allegations made by the representative of Israel was that Libya is supporting the rebellion in the south of Sudan. This allegation is a complete reversal of the facts. The truth of the matter is that those who are actively supporting the rebellion, training its cadres and providing it with weapons and military advisers, are other countries and circles and not Libya.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): This is not the first time my delegation has explained its position concerning the so-called Gulf crisis and its effect on the events, past and present, in our region.

However, it seems that the representative of the United States has a problem there. He does not want to read or take account of the peace initiative put forward by Iraq on 12 August. His other problem is that he cannot hide his country's absolute bias in favour of Israel and Israel's aggressive policies, which are the cause of the myriad problems and tragedies of our region.

A further problem of the representative of the United States is that his country calls upon the Arab and Palestinian side to make endless concessions. Therefore, the statement made this morning by the representative of the United States was, as ever, misleading and full of distortions.

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

My delegation emphasizes that the matter, as far as we are concerned, is not limited solely to the principle of linkage and that our position is reflected very clearly in the Iraqi initiative that was put forward on 12 August. That initiative provides a comprehensive legal and procedural framework for resolving all the problems of the region, foremost among which is the question of Palestine. We want to see an end to the Zionist racist occupation of Arab teritories, and we want to secure recognition of the inalienable rights of the Arab Palestinian people, foremost among which is the right to self-determination and to the establishment of its independent State in line with Security Council resolutions relating to our region.

Therefore, Iraq's peace initiative is a comprehensive one that would open the way to addressing the problems of the region as an integral whole. In such a situation the door would be wide open for the Security Council, with proper authority, to play its role and exercise its authority even-handedly and not selectively as has been the case in the situation created by the United States of America through its persistent attempts to impose its will on the Council, thus forcing it to adopt discriminatory and biased resolutions.

Everybody knows that the United States decided unilaterally to send forces to occupy Arab territories and impose a siege on Iraq for the purpose of controlling the oil resources of the region and the economy of the world, especially the third world's, in addition to the United States other objective, namely, the protection of the Zionist entity. Having achieved all that, the United States forced the Security Council to adopt the sinister war resolution against Iraq just as it had in the case of the preceding resolutions, while, at the same time, it stands with all its might against the adoption by the Security Council of any resolution that would condemn Israel or force it to put an end to its occupation of the Arab

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

territories or would even call for an international peace conference on the Middle East. Indeed, the United States has for 40 years shown disregard for the United Nations and the Security Council.

When the representative of the United States speaks of the so-called Gulf crisis he uses the language of war, violence and confrontation, whereas, when he speaks of the question of Palestine, that language evaporates, and is replaced with smooth talk of the rejection of violence, self-restraint, flexibility and direct negotiations. This may be smooth, but it is rejected, because it not only equates the brute force of Israeli occupation with the suffering of the Arab Palestinian people under occupation but also takes the side of the occupying aggressor. This cannot deceive anyone here. Everybody knows how biased is the United States in favour of Israel; everybody knows how the United States prevents the international community from doing anything to implement United Nations resolutions which call for enabling the Arab Palestinian people to enjoy its inalienable rights; everybody knows how the racist Zionist entity rejects every peace initiative, even if it is put forward by its mentors and protectors.

So far as the peoples of the region and the Arab nation are concerned, the occupation by the United States of holy Arab lands is an extension of the Zionist occupation of the holy land of Palestine. It is the Arab lands, not the lands of Europe or the United States, that are under the yoke of the alien American Zionist occupation.

There is no doubt that every grain of sand in the Arabian desert, which extends from the ocean to the Gulf, rejects this illegitimate and illegal occupation. But history teaches us that, sooner or later, the Arabian desert will regain its sanctity and its purity.

Mr. BADI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset, I should like to affirm and support the Sudan representative's statement regarding the good relations between the Jamahiriya and the Sudan.

The Zionist entity's representative, while speaking on the item under discussion, tried as usual to drag the General Assembly into extraneous questions that have no relation whatsoever with the grave situation under discussion, namely the occupation and annexation by the Zionist entity of the Arab territories. This flies in the face of all laws and so does the genocide campaign which can only be described as a Fascist Nazi act against a defenceless people and a violation of its most fundamental human rights.

The attempt by the representative of the Zionist entity to drag in the name of my country and of some other Arab countries is but a transparent ploy to divert attention from the crimes against humanity perpetrated by his racist régime. The United Nations has already described this entity as a non-peace-loving State and has described Zionism as a form of racism.

The representative of the Zionist entity spoke of terrorism. What terrorism is greater than the annihilation of an entire people? What terrorism is greater than the crimes committed by that régime headed by the notorious terrorist Shamir, the murderer of Bernadotte, and Sharon the "hero" of the Sabra and Shatila massacres?

The statement by the representative of the Zionist entity regarding Chad-Libyan relations is a baseless allegation. Everyone knows that bonds of a common destiny exist between Libya and Chad. Everyone knows that the two countries have agreed to settle all the problems between them and have agreed to take the matter to the International Court of Justice in a fraternal spirit. The representative of the Zionist entity forgets that this artificial entity annexed

(Mr. Badi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Holy Al-Quds and Syrian Arab Golan, has occupied the entire territory of Palestine and stands in defiance of all international laws and norms.

The settler-colonialist operation by the Zionist entity in Palestine, though it has been condemned by the international community, continues unabated regardless of all international resolutions. It is high time for the United Nations to put a stop to the massacres perpetrated against the Palestinian people by this spoilt illegitimate child, this régime that has built its foundations on expansionism, terrorism, annexation, murder and destruction. It is high time for the United Nations to take the necessary measures to put an end to the genocide, apply Chapter VII of the Charter in the interests of justice and enable the Palestinian people to exercise its right to self-determination and the establishment of its own Arab State on the whole territory of Palestine.

The PRESIDENT: Action on the draft resolutions relating to this item will be taken on Thursday, 13 December, in the afternoon.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE OCCASION OF HUMAN RIGHTS DAY 1990

The PRESIDENT: Today marks the forty-second anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The United Nations rightly observes this day as Human Rights Day. In this connection I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the text of the message issued by the Secretary-General on the occasion of Human Rights Day 1990 and circulated in press release SG/SM/4526.

Before we continue our work for today, it is therefore appropriate for us to reflect upon the significance of this event.

It is to the lasting credit of the General Assembly that on 10 December 1948 it adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a declaration with lasting and dynamic effect for mankind, because it not only recognizes that

(The President)

all human beings are born equal and with inalienable rights and fundamental freedoms but, equally, commits the Organization to uphold, promote and protect the human rights of every individual.

In one of the paragraphs of its preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights also sets out a very important and essential factor: if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, human rights should be protected by the rule of law. The rule of law is the golden thread essential to promoting positive development within the national community for man and greater harmony and friendly relations between nations.

The General Assembly in the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights committed itself to the advent of a world in which all human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want, and proclaimed this to be the highest aspiration of the common people. For, after all, we are here to serve the common people and, as we commemorate the forty-second anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is imperative that we ask ourselves to what extent this aspiration has, after more than four decades, become a reality.

A belief in human rights is today more present and widespread than it ever has been before; yet this in itself highlights even more the necessity to ensure higher moral standards and integrity in their full observance.

(The President)

The decolonization process is most certainly a great achievement for the United Nations which owes its success to the inspiration of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, the international community must continue to work together to ensure that this process be equally accompanied by a universal observance of human rights. Human rights know no boundaries. The sovereignty of a people is thwarted by the denial of human rights and the trampling on human dignity.

During the course of this session, as in the past, the Assembly has pronounced itself on the plight of many who are denied such rights, foremost among which are the Palestinian people and the people of South Africa. In more recent months a new added concern has been the right of the people of Kuwait following the invasion and annexation of their homeland.

That consistent commitment to the right of peoples to political freedom which has echoed from this Hall over the years should continue to be the hallmark of the General Assembly. Political oppression, however, is not the exclusive threat which undermines the enjoyment of human rights and dignity. The Universal Declaration spells out and emphasizes freedom from want.

Can the global community, which in so many other respects is fast becoming a global village, ignore the misery and suffering imposed on millions world wide due to the failure to adopt as yet an international development strategy which ensures social justice and life in freedom and dignity for all members of the human family?

Future generations will look back and judge us by our ability to match words with deeds, our resolve to go beyond inspiring pronouncements by translating them into action.

Indeed, this is no easy task. Like other achievements registered throughout past years which helped overcome and bring to an end the cold war, future achievements which ensure a more caring international community will require brave decisions.

(The President)

Yet they are decisions which will have to be made, for if we fail in this duty imposed on our generation, we will rightfully be held responsible for having done little or nothing to avoid the perpetration of "barbarous acts which outrage the conscience of mankind" - barbarous acts which history shows are the result of disregard and contempt for human rights.

On a personal note, in my life both as a politician and as a lawyer, I have discovered that human rights have value only if they become living realities in society. Perhaps there is no more tiring hypocrisy than living with human rights proclaimed on paper and disregarded in practice.

We have all to realize and understand that the commemoration of human rights charters and declarations will only assume a value when they are not the result of lip-service or sticks with which to beat others when occasion arises and convenience so suits, but when there is that sense of belonging to human rights as part of the living structure within which man gravitates, free from fear, free from want and free from threat and use of force, in full recognitior of the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family, the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.

AGENDA ITEM 11

REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (A/45/2)

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Barely three weeks before the end of our term as a member, we wish to share with the Assembly some of the fruits of our experience in the Security Council. We are prompted to do so by our delegation's understanding that when we were elected to serve on that body our sole purpose would be to strive to interpret the general thinking of all delegations, in keeping with the provisions of Article 24 of the Charter, which stipulates that in carrying out its duties the Security Council shall act on behalf of the Members of the United Nations.

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

As the General Assembly is now considering the report of the Security Council, allow me to take this opportunity to convey the Colombian Government's gratitude to each and every delegation that placed its trust in our country in making it a member of the Council for 1989 and 1990.

These two years have been intense ones, and we undertook them with the desire of contributing to the cause of justice, equality and the maintenance of international peace and security. The changes that have occurred in international relations following the thawing of the cold war have necessarily led to a readjustment in political positions and consequently a new conception of the way in which the Security Council operates.

In the cold war period, the interests at stake within the Council were such that the Powers that were permanent members exercised close scrutiny over the manner in which its rules or procedures were applied and the United Nations Charter interpreted. As a result, those aspects were constantly borne in mind, in view of the risk of failing to achieve unanimity among the permanent members required in the Council in accordance with Article 27 of the Charter. Thus, it could be asserted that there was political vigilance regarding the validity of and compliance with the principles of international law and the relevant procedural rules.

Today, there is talk of a new era, and an attempt is being made to justify non-compliance with the rules on the grounds of political expediency, thus disregarding rights that all its members are recognized as possessing. In the name of that new international political order, in practice the rules have been changed. My delegation does not object to changes being made in the rules provided there exists a wish on the part of the international community to accept such

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

change; if this is our purpose we should examine the benefits of such a move so as to ensure that the changes take the form of norms that apply, erga omnes, to all cases and in all circumstances. If we fail to take prompt action of this kind, we shall ourselves be permitting the advent of a new era in which the dictatorship of the permanent members will prevail to the detriment of all countries, including those industrialized countries that are not permanent members of the Council and the developing world.

One of the most significant proposals that has emerged in what is termed the new climate of understanding is that of promoting the primacy of and respect for international law over politics. This unquestionably deserves the support of the whole of the community of nations. My delegation has been among the first to endorse this idea, and we hope that we will move forward from the formulation stage into that of full effectiveness. Otherwise, we shall become convinced that the international context has not changed or, if it has, that the change has been at the expense of the legitimate interests of a large number of countries for which we are still waiting to see more promising signs of the dawn of this new era. We are convinced that the General Assembly will have the wisdom to read this situation aright and to undertake the commitments that the circumstances demand.

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

Forty-five years have elapsed since the San Francisco meeting at which the foundations for the creation of the United Nations were laid and the Charter that governs our proceedings was adopted. That was a time when the world, freshly scarred by war, was divided into victors and vanquished; that was a world in which the Powers, through colonialism, extended far and wide, a world in which the significant advances in communications now familiar to us had not been made. Consequently, these factors determined the design of the Organization.

Today no one can deny that that world has changed considerably. The number of Members of the Organization has tripled, the world in which we live is both more independent and more closely interrelated, the "enemy State" concepts of the Charter no longer exist, a new world has emerged through decolonization, and new terms of reference are evolving in international relations, including the right of peoples to economic, political and social development. The time is past when distances made communication difficult. We are witnessing new developments in science and technology that enable the world not only to be kept constantly informed, but also to analyse each event in depth as it occurs.

In short, we are living in a world of constant change, change so great and so swift that we have no chance to assimilate it in its true extent and profundity. The political and legal balance that implicitly underlies Article 27 of the Charter is being overtaken by international developments whose extremely diverse effects are being felt by the countries of the developing world. The time has come for all countries to enjoy more active and more democratic participation in the United Nations, so that we may act in consonance with the world in which we live.

Speaking at the third regular session of the United Nations in 1949, the head of the Colombian delegation stated:

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

"Colombia, I repeat, has always refused to vote for the veto and has striven to limit its application, with the exception of cases involving decisions to be taken within the spirit of Chapter VII of the Charter.

"We cast a negative vote, because we foresaw quite clearly what would happen: the veto would become a constant cause of paralysis in the Security Council, and would consequently be a factor that would jeopardize the prestige of the United Nations. We voted against the veto, because we considered it to be undemocratic and contrary to the fundamental principle of the Charter concerning the sovereign equality of States.

"The San Francisco Charter, as we are all aware, was the result of a series of concessions and compromises. We all knew that when the time should come when reform would be possible, we would all express our points of view and return to our most fundamental positions."

At the historic meeting of the Security Council that took place on 29 November this year, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia stated:

"We are firmly convinced that situations such as this are in part a result of the ambivalent and selective language that prevailed in the Council for over four decades. During that time, the power of the veto was used for political considerations, disregarding international law and order in situations in which world peace was breached." (S/PV.2963, pp. 39-40)

This statement draws our attention to the need for the United Nations promptly to make changes in its manner of operation and the rules that govern it, so as to reflect current realities faithfully. The so-called right of veto is unquestionably one of the aspects that sooner or later has to be addressed. My delegation is fully aware that a change in this regard requires time for study, but we are quite convinced that this is the most important challenge that, however

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

difficult it may appear in the face of possible resistance, the United Nations will have to face.

In brief, my delegation advocates a strong United Nations, which means one in which there is respect for the principles of the Charter and, above all, in which the right of sovereign equality among States is more in evidence, and not an Organization in which the non-permanent members of the Security Council are merely spectators of an increasingly interdependent international reality that necessarily requires co-operation, mutual support and respect among all States, with a view to promoting the development and well-being of all peoples. This is in essence the very meaning of all our endeavours and the only approach that can ultimately guarantee peace in the world.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): My delegation would like to express our appreciation to the Secretariat for the report of the Security Council, submitted to the General Assembly today in the document which members have before them.

Malaysia would like to take this opportunity to express our deepest gratitude to all members who elected Malaysia to serve on the Security Council for two years, from 1989 to 1990. We have indeed been honoured and privileged to have been given that trust and that confidence. For us, it has been a very historic opportunity, as we last served over 25 years ago. We have taken our work seriously in all the deliberations of the Council and, it is to be hoped, with a high sense of responsibility.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

I feel it is also important to put on record that we consider our representation in the Council to extend beyond our own national entity, and that we have a larger duty to a larger constituency - the Asian Group and those others that elected us, the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, and others.

Now as we leave the Council at the end of this month my delegation feels an obligation to record some assessments and observations with regard to the Council's work.

First, we consider ourselves fortunate to have served on the Council during a watershed period in the history of the United Nations, when the world is witnessing the end of the cold war and the ushering in of a new world order.

The vision of a new world order involves the revival of the concept of collective security, whereby the United Nations, as envisaged by its founders, is to play a central role in the upholding of the rule of law in inter-State relations and the maintenance of international peace and security. Clearly, the Security Council bears a special responsibility, and the realization of this vision is possible only when there is open dialogue and close co-operation between the five permanent members of the Council, which have been given special powers by the framers of the Charter, between the permanent 5 and the other 10 non-permanent members and, equally important, between the 15 members of the Council and all the general membership of the General Assembly.

From the experience of the cold war it is obvious that for the Council to function effectively open discussions and co-operation between the five are essential. We have seen in the last several months that, when a spirit of co-operation and consensus exists among the five, remarkable progress can be made in addressing some of the difficult regional conflicts. This was true in the case of Namibia and also in the case of Cambodia. The recent action by the Security

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

Council in moving quickly and firmly and not countenancing the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait demonstrates how effectively the United Nations can act in upholding the principle of inter-State relations given a non-ideological and non-bloc approach. This has given rise to renewed hopes about the ability of the Council to revive the concept of collective security as conceived by the founders of the Organization.

However, one basic problem which will feature in the Council's operations in the future needs to be highlighted. It has become almost common, if not standard, practice with regard to the various resolutions adopted recently for the permanent five to carry on intensive discussions among themselves and then to present a broadly acceptable text to the others. Only then are the rest brought into the picture. The unity of the permanent five is very important, but the Council cannot allow an exclusivity of decision-making. It would be intolerable, and probably dangerous, if exclusivity were also accompanied by a preponderance of influence, or dominant influence, by one permanent member of the Council.

The concept of collective responsibility and of an enhanced role for the United Nations, as represented by the Security Council, can operate only in the context of a continuous, full and effective interaction of views, and not in the context of the dominance of one, or a few, to the exclusion of the views of others.

The situation in the Council now presents a new challenge to third world countries and the Non-Aligned Movement. Surely we do not want to see an ineffectual Council affected by divisions between the five permanent members on the grounds of ideological and bloc politics replaced by a Council in the situation I have described. It is therefore important for the third world countries and the Non-Aligned Movement to unite and constitute a check and balance so that the Council can act as an impartial peace-maker without having to succumb to the selective standards and dictates of certain countries.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

In this regard, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, of which I am proud, I must say that the unity of the non-aligned caucus in the Council is absolutely essential. That unity is based not on coercion or some strange methods but purely on the basis of upholding the principles of the Non-Aligned Movement, the rule of law and even-handedness in addressing issues affecting peace and security. In order to ensure that unity, the non-aligned members as a whole carry the special responsibility of ensuring the election to the Council of members who are in a position to uphold these principles. We cannot afford a lapse or a failure, as it would mean a split in the Non-Aligned Movement, as reflected in the caucus, that would be detrimental to the interests of the Movement, the developing world, the rule of law and even-handedness in inter-State relations.

It is also our view, as I mentioned earlier, that, when there are increasing expectations that the United Nations could play a more effective role in the maintenance of international peace and security, it is equally important that there be an effective dialogue between the members of the Security Council and members of the General Assembly, because the 15 members of the Council cannot possibly reflect the consensus of the United Nations, which consists of 159 Members.

While the Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, Article 24 of the Charter is clear that it is the Members of the United Nations as a whole that confer that responsibility on the Council, and that the Security Council only acts on their behalf. My delegation feels that on very important issues of war and peace members of the Security Council carry a special moral responsibility to consult the broader membership of the United Nations.

With regard to the Security Council's report to the General Assembly, my delegation would like to make two comments. In our view, the Council's report

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

should be transparent and contain the necessary elements of accountability. Once the Council has adopted a resolution there must be a system of accountability. We do not wish to see a situation in which the Council is involved only in the formulation of a resolution, after which implementation is left only to certain members, and therefore is outside the accountability of the United Nations machinery. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia made this clear in his statement to the Council on 29 November 1990.

For instance, Malaysia regretted that Security Council resolution 678 (1990), which authorizes the use of all necessary means to implement resolutions to restore Kuwait's sovereignty, did not provide a clear system of reporting and accountability to the Security Council, with regard to actions by participating countries.

We all wish to see the United Nations effective and universally respected for its integrity. The only way to sustain such an Organization is for the principle of transparency and accountability of the United Nations to be reflected in all United Nations bodies.

My delegation has noted that the Security Council's report to the General Assembly covers the period from June 1989 until June 1990. It does not cover the calendar year, which means that the report is prepared after some members have left the Security Council. The Secretariat gives members who have left the Council the opportunity to express their views for the report, but it would be appropriate and meaningful if the period covered by the report coincided exactly with the term of membership of the non-permanent members - the calendar year, from January to December.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

In conclusion, I should like to take this opportunity to recommend that in future the report of the Council to the General Assembly cover one full calendar year and that there be greater transparency and accountability in the Council's work. This is absolutely necessary if we are to lay a good foundation for a United Nations that is more effective in the maintenance of international peace and security, a goal cherished by the international community as we leave the cold war and the ideological conflict of the last 40 years behind us.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, 21 years ago in the Assembly the delegation of your country, Malta, drew the attention of all members to the importance of the item we are considering today and to the need for the Assembly to consider the work of the Security Council more appropriately and to be in a better position to state its views on the activities of that important organ of our Organization.

The reason for this is clearly reflected in the Charter of the Organization. The General Assembly does not receive a report on the work of the Council simply to satisfy members' curiosity about what may or may not be happening in the rooms in which the Council works, nor does the Council send the report to the Assembly as a mere favour or as a matter of courtesy to States that are not members of the Council. The Council reports to the Assembly and the Assembly considers that report because both bodies have an obligation, one to report and the other to consider the report, in conformity with Article 15 and Article 24, paragraph 3, of of the Charter.

It is regrettable that, in spite of the just warning of the delegation of Malta and subsequent statements by the delegations of other countries, the Assembly has not yet been able to establish suitable mechanisms to ensure that it is in a position to review and form an opinion on the work of the Security Council.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

We feel that this is a matter of fundamental importance because it should be recalled that the special responsibility of Council members is not the result of an inherited right or a matter of divine grace; it derives from a mandate conferred on them by the membership of the Organization, which also laid down in the Charter that it was to receive regular information from the members of the Council about what they had done or failed to do.

The report before us for consideration has been prepared by the Secretariat - for which we thank it - but the Secretariat is not responsible for any of the report's attributes or defects. That responsibility rests above all with the Council itself and with the Assembly, which must be able to get the best possible data in this document and, especially, to make good use of the consideration of this agenda item to review the Council's activities.

As I said, on another occasion, since Cuba has the privilege of being a member of the Council at the moment, this is a useful document, but only because it will be preserved in our archives as a compendium of letters sent to the Security Council and resolutions adopted by it. To be frank, the report is as useful as other similarly voluminous documents that are not consulted on a daily basis. I venture to suggest that perhaps not all of us have read every page of the document now before us; just as no one has read every telephone directory of every city in the world, although no one would deny its usefulness. In the case we are considering, I am thinking in particular of the Yellow Pages in these directories, for what is in the document was, in a sense, familiar to everyone before it was produced. It contains no explanation of the Council's decisions or of the obstacles that prevented the adoption of any decision.

I will bring just one example to the Assembly's attention. The Security Council has a subsidiary body, the Committee established by resolution 421 (1977)

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

concerning the question of South Africa. Those who have ventured to delve into this voluminous document will have noted on page 138 a four-line reference to that Committee. And what do those four lines indicate? They indicate that on 11 December 1989 - a year ago tomorrow - the Committee in question adopted its report to the Council on activities during the period 1980 to 1989, that is, on the Committee's work over the past decade. Ten years' work by an important subsidiary body of the Security Council is reflected in four lines in this voluminous report of the Security Council. Nothing is said about what the Council did with regard to the Committee's report in the year following its submission, what problems the Committee encountered in connection with the implementation of Security Council resolution 421 (1977), to what extent the resolution was or was not respected, or what the Council proposes to do about the recommendations, the information or the details submitted by the Committee a year ago.

The General Assembly might be interested in stating its views on what the Security Council has or has not done in this matter, since, as we all know, sanctions and resolutions against those that supply weapons to South Africa have been adopted by the Council only after many and repeated demands, and, with the votes of the overwhelming majority of the members of the Assembly, have been reiterated year after year.

My delegation does not wish to dwell at length on this matter in this statement. We wish merely to say that we fully share the views expressed here by the representatives of Colombia and Malaysia, both of whose countries are about to reach the end of their terms on the Security Council, during which they have discharged - and are, indeed, still discharging - their mandates with great ability.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

We should like to advance an idea similar to one they put forward - namely, that now that so many references are being made to new international realities and we are hearing terms like "the threshold of a new world order", it is more important than ever before that each and every principal organ of the Organization discharge its responsibilities fully. In particular, the General Assembly must discharge its paramount responsibility of considering the work of the Organization's other principal organs, including the Security Council, and the relations between them.

If the much-heralded new international order is to be in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter, it must be an international order that is marked, first and foremost, by respect for the sovereign equality of States and by respect for all the principles of the Charter. Furthermore, the principles of the democratization of international affairs must be reflected within the Organization. That entails, on the one hand, democratizing the Security Council's procedures and actions and, on the other, ensuring that in the relations between the Council and the General Assembly there is respect for a principle basic to any democracy: the principle of accountability.

The Security Council and its members must feel answerable to those who elected them or conferred certain responsibilities upon them. They must report on the way in which they are discharging those responsibilities. We have a tangible example of that at this very moment. A few days ago the General Assembly adopted by a large majority, with the opposition of only two States - which are well known - various resolutions on the question of Palestine. Some of those resolutions call upon the Security Council to take some specific action. Today we are in the fortieth day of the Council's consideration of certain action. This should have been a normal diplomatic process, but it has become a rather complicated procedural

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

battle. All we are trying to do in the Council is to make it responsive to the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly, which has given the Council this special responsibility. We must now wait a few more hours to find out whether the Council will meet again and whether we will be allowed to have our draft resolution considered by the hardly extraordinary procedure of voting.

That is what is going on - and, as everyone knows, has been going on for many years now - with regard to the item before us. The General Assembly has time and again, year after year, pronounced itself in favour of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. It has, in one way or another, called on the Security Council to do something in connection with this item.

The Security Council cannot be regarded as a secret society or a privileged club for one or more of its permanent members. The Security Council is an organ created by this Organization, by its Members, which freely decided to confer certain responsibilities on it. At the same time, however, under the Charter, they reserved for themselves the right and the authority to review the Council's actions, and to do so regularly.

We hope that, as part of the changes that have taken place in our Organization and as an expression of the new trends in the world, the Assembly will increasingly be in a position to examine in depth the activities of the Security Council, and that we shall be able to discuss and analyse the ways and means we feel can contribute to greater respect for the obligations of the Charter. We hope, too, that this annual discussion will depart from the kind of routine exercise it has unfortunately become and will provide an opportunity for an accounting to be made to the Assembly in the most appropriate manner.

The PRESIDENT: May I consider that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Security Council (A/45/2)?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has concluded its consideration of agenda item 11.

AGENDA ITEM 17 (continued)

APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS

(g) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES: NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/45/107 and Corr.1)

The PRESIDENT: As indicated in document A/45/107 and Corr.1, the General Assembly, by its resolution 43/222 B of 21 December 1988, decided that the Committee on Conferences should be composed of 21 members to be appointed by the President of the Assembly, after consultations with the chairmen of the regional groups, for a period of three years, on the basis of geographical distribution.

The Assembly further decided that each year one third of the Committee's membership shall retire and that retiring members shall be eligible for reappointment.

Since the terms of office of Chile, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Japan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expire on 31 December 1990, it is necessary for the President of the General Assembly to appoint during the current session seven members to fill the resulting vacancies. The members so appointed will serve for a period of three years beginning on 1 January 1991.

After consultations with the chairmen of the regional groups I have appointed Chile, Cyprus, France, Gabo Japan, Kenya and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as members of the Committee on Conferences, with effect from 1 January 1991.

May I take it that the Assembly takes note of that appointment?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I should also like to draw the attention of the Assembly to a letter dated 3 October 1990 (A/45/567), in which the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Secretary-General that through the accession of the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany, with effect from 3 October 1990, the two German States had united to form one sovereign State.

Consequently, the seat that had been occupied by the former German Democratic Republic in the Committee on Conferences became vacant as at 3 October 1990. The term of office of the former German Democratic Republic was scheduled to expire on 31 December 1991.

After consultations with the chairmen of the regional groups, I have appointed Hungary as a member of the Committee on Conferences to fill the vacant seat, with immediate effect.

May I consider that the Assembly takes note of this appointment?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We have concluded our consideration of sub-item (g) of agenda item 17.

AGENDA ITEM 41

QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The PRESIDENT: I understand that there is no request to consider agenda item 41 at the present session.

If that is the case, may I take it that the Assembly decides to include the item in the provisional agenda of the forty-sixth session?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 41.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.